



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety and Security
One Ashburton Place, Room 2133
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Tel: (617) 727-7775
TTY Tel: (617) 727-6618
Fax: (617) 727-4764
www.mass.gov/eopss

CHARLES D. BAKER
Governor

KARYN E. POLITO
Lt. Governor

TERRENCE M. REIDY
Secretary

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Fifth Meeting-The Questionnaire Subcommittee

Date: January 5, 2022

Time: 10:00AM-11:00AM

Microsoft Teams Virtual Location: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only) 857-327-9245 Phone Conference ID: 105 363 301#

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome, Roll Call and Introductions

The meeting is called to order at 10:05AM

		Video/Call	Absent
1	Chair- Kara Hayes	X	
2	Strong Oak Lefebvre	X	
3	Judge Rosemary Minehan		X
4	Carolyn Boyes-Watson	X	

EOPSS Staff: Anjeza Xhemollari, Arielle Mullaney

Others in attendance: Brenda Nolan, Joann Della Guistina

2. Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes from August 17, 2021

Carolyn made a motion to approve. Strong Oak seconded the motion. Roll call was taken to approve the meeting minutes.

3. Discussion of follow-up interviews

Kara- I need to be honest with both of you Carolyn and Strong Oak, I did not get to any of my field interviews, but I have reached out to people to schedule things and I'm in the process of following up with Visioning BEAR. I just want to update the members of the public and my fellow committee members that I'm still in the process and my apologies for being so far behind. Carolyn, I know you have been able to do some of the work and Strong Oak in our last full committee meeting you indicated that you reached out to people without much success of getting people to commit to an interview.

Carolyn- I had 10 people on my list. I spoke with 7 of them. I wrote a summary and sent it to Anjeza. I summarized everything and the calls were lengthy. I have 3 left, 1 is you Kara, and the other two have reached back to me and I'm in the process of completing them.

Strong Oak-I talked to Erin this week. She was confused about the respondents and who sent all those C4RJ. They're involved in 31 different police departments and 3 different DA Offices. Our session was recorded, and I was tempted to ask other things, but I wanted it to be consistent with the questions. So, this way the report accurately would reflect exactly what was said and we would have something to fall back upon and like Carolyn said, it was quite lengthy interview. So, we did one interview to cover all C4RJ. I have not heard from anyone else; I will do another follow-up.

Kara- Thank you both. As we know there's some hesitancy about governmental intervention and interviews, and I had kind of raised this at the full committee meeting and was hoping to get some clarification. These interviews are informal, and we are doing this since we did not have an academic partner. The question for you Arielle is and when we report this to the full committee, everything becomes a public record. Our own notes in the process are **NOT** a public record. I recognize in asking that question that sometimes community work can feel a little uncertain about what governmental entities do with their information.

Arielle-That makes perfect sense. I will say you're right. Your notes that you have when you are conducting meetings are your notes. They are yours entirely. Now, whenever you learn whatever is in your notes, you share in the public forums and that information gets to be part of the record.

Kara-Thank you for that. I appreciate that clarification. Is there anything in that wheelhouse or Arielle's response that comes to mind.

Carolyn-Not for me. I'm more interested in the big picture on what we are really trying to do with this information. How is serving us in any way? The important point is what are we trying to do with this information and how will it serve our mission? That's the overall process. Many reason to collect information.

Strong Oak-It's important that our notes stay confidential. One thing that came up, the idea that 31 different programs for a member of our committee, and of course I didn't raise this issue because I stuck to the questions. 31 different programs with one program, small organization, it looks like its spreading out statewide and I wonder on what is the conflict of interest policy when people that were involved in drafting the language for RJAC to begin with and how this program benefits and others don't. How has this never come up or has never been addressed. I remember taking the conflict of interest to be part of the committee and I must be honest, I approached Erin and Becky a long time ago, over a year ago, and I'm counting on these notes to stay here. They were going to look into this themselves, and get back to me, and ask that I not talk about it until they did. Here it is, this late in the process and I haven't heard on what occurred. I honored the confidentiality that I agreed to, and I never raised it but when I do the interviews here, we go again. This is why I decided to record them for our safety, and I don't have a judgment about this, I have a question. Its not about the quality of the work. Its about conflict of interest issue. 31 programs for one committee member and it has never been addressed.

Kara-I sit in a criminal justice space, and I recognize our legislation is limited to kinds of work that it covers, and it could be unhelpful to diversity of programs. Carolyn and Susan have encouraged us to think bigger of our legislative mandate and for the reasons that you are speaking. I do think it's something that could be lifted to the full RJAC. I also recognize that you're raising this in confidence, so just some food for thought. But if you were raising something, I think we have heard at the table in a variety of different ways.

Carolyn-I deeply share this concern and it's probably why I'm here in this committee in a lot of ways. The legislative was very narrowly written by one organization and the type of restorative justice it supports and people argued that's the best they could do. I did not support that. This committee is result of that. We should have a broader vision and decide our own destiny as a committee and what we think Restorative Justice is. That one paragraph about inventory drives me nuts. It's not well thought out. Let's open other possibilities. We are not bound by it. We are interested in the spirit of the law, not the letter of the law. Very board understanding of what our mission.

Kara-We have you for 3 more minutes before we lose you and I want to go over the rest of the agenda.

4. Next Steps

Kara-On my next steps, I know that I need to finish my interviews for the public and the committee.

Carolyn- On my next steps we have is the funding and have this subcommittee continue. What will we do with the work that we're doing? Now we have funding, and I don't want to be bound to the legislation. What are our intentions? I think that's a decision for the whole committee. That should be an agenda item.

Kara-We should raise that up.

Strong Oak-At the next meeting, I will talk about the conflict of interest. I can't keep this confidential, not after finding out that they have 31 programs. There needs to be an end to this process. Why aren't some people following up? Why didn't they respond? How will the funding be used? Should we create a deadline?

5. Open Session for Topics not Reasonably Anticipated within 48 Hours of the Meeting

N/A

6. Public Comment (10 minutes)

Brenda-concern that the legislation favors C4RJ and its expansion across the state.

Joanne- there are no RJ programs in her county. Expressed appreciation for the work being done by the subcommittee.

7. Adjourn

Carolyn had to leave the meeting at 10:30am. No quorum after that time.